



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/734,887	12/13/2000	Krishna A. Bharat	0026-0004	5677

44989 7590 03/22/2005

HARRITY & SNYDER, LLP
11240 WAPLES MILL ROAD
SUITE 300
FAIRFAX, VA 22030

EXAMINER

MIZRAHI, DIANE D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2165

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/734,887

Applicant(s)

BHARAT ET AL.

Examiner

DIANE D. MIZRAHI

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2004.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☒ Claim(s) 9,10,20 and 23 is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8,11-19, 21 and 22 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- DIANE D. MIZRAHI
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

III. Detailed Action

Claims 1-23 are currently pending.

All previous presented rejections of the claims are hereby withdrawn as to being moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC , 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-8, 11-19 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims are directed to a non-statutory subject matter, specifically, directed towards an abstract idea.

The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that abstractions are not patentable. "An idea of itself is not patentable". Rubber-Tip Pencil Co. V. Howard, 20 Wall. 498, 07. Phenomena of nature, though just discovered, mental processes, abstract intellectual concepts are not patentable, as they are the basic tools of scientific and technological work Gottschalk v. Benson, 175 USPQ 673, 675 (S Ct 1972). It is a common place that laws of nature, physical phenomena, and abstract ideas are not patentable subject matter Parker v. Flook, 197 USPQ 193, 201 (S

Ct 1978). A process that consists solely of the manipulation of an abstract idea is not concrete or tangible. See In re Warmerdam, 33 F.3d 1354, 1360, 31 USPQ2d 1754, 1759 (Fed. Cir. 1994). See also Schrader, 22 F.3d at 295, 30 USPQ2d at 1459.

Claims 1-8, and 11-19 represent an abstract idea that do not provide a practical application in the technological arts. There is no manipulation of data nor is there any transformation of data from one state to another state being performed in "A method for providing search results"; "A system that provides search results"; and "A method for determining an editorial opinion parameter for use in ranking search results".

Actually, no post-computer process activity is found in the technological arts. "A method for providing search results"; "A system that provides search results"; and "A method for determining an editorial opinion parameter for use in ranking search results" is not a physical transformation. Thus, no physical transformation is performed, no practical application is found. Also, the claims do not appear to correspond to a specific machine or manufacture disclosed within the specification and thus encompass any product of the class configured in any manner to perform the underlying process. Consequently, the claims are analyzed based upon the underlying process, and are thus rejected as being directed.

Claims 21-22 represent an abstract idea that do not provide a practical application in the technological arts. There is no manipulation of data nor is there any transformation of data from one state to another state being performed in "... containing a data structure". Actually, no post-computer process activity is found in the technological arts. "... Containing a data structure" is not a physical transformation. Thus, no physical transformation is performed, no practical application is found. Consequently, the claims are thus rejected as being directed.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 9-10, 20 and 23 are allowed over the prior art made of record.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding Independent Claims 9-10, Applicant's particular receiving a search query that includes at least one search term, obtaining one or more objects based on at least on search tem, determining whether the search query corresponds to at least one plurality of query themes, determining a score for each of the one or more objects based on whether the search query corresponds to at least one plurality of query themes, and

providing a ranked list containing one or more objects based on the determined score in combination with the other limitations of the claims, was not disclosed by, would not have been obvious over, nor would have been fairly suggested by the prior art of record.

The dependent claims, being further limiting to the independent claims, definite and enabled by the Specification are also allowed. The closest prior art fails to anticipate or render Applicant's limitations above obvious.

Regarding Independent Claim 20, Applicant's particular method for determining an editorial opinion parameter for use in ranking search results which includes identifying for each of a group of search query themes, a first set of objects as favored objects, identifying for each of the search query themes, a second set of objects as non-favored objects and determining an editorial opinion parameter for each of the objects in the first and second sets of objects in combination with the other limitations of the claims, was not disclosed by, would not have been obvious over, nor would have been fairly suggested by the prior art of record.

The dependent claims, being further limiting to the independent claims, definite and enabled by the Specification

are also allowed. The closest prior art fails to anticipate or render Applicant's limitations above obvious.

Regarding Independent Claim 23, Applicant's particular plurality of query themes in which information identifying for each of the plurality of query themes at least one favored or non-favored item associated with the query themes, and an editorial parameter associated with each favored and non-favored item wherein query search terms are received, items are retrieved, a score is determined for each of the retrieved items, plurality of query themes are identified, and retrieved items are matched according to favored or non-favored with one query theme, and the items are adjusted by a score when the items are retrieved as being associated with a favored or non-favored item in combination with the other limitations of the claims, was not disclosed by, would not have been obvious over, nor would have been fairly suggested by the prior art of record.

The dependent claims, being further limiting to the independent claims, definite and enabled by the Specification are also allowed. The closest prior art fails to anticipate or render Applicant's limitations above obvious.

Other Prior Art Made of Record

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. U.S. patents

and U.S. patent application publications will not be supplied with Office actions. Examiners advises the Applicant that the cited U.S. patents and patent application publications are available for download via the Office's PAIR. As an alternate source, all U.S. patents and patent application publications are available on the USPTO web site (www.uspto.gov), from the Office of Public Records and from commercial sources. For the use of the Office's PAIR system, Applicants may refer to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at <http://www.uspto.gov/ebc/index.html> or 1-866-217-9197.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diane D. Mizrahi whose telephone number is 571-272-4079. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on (571) 272-4083. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 305-3900 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2165

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



Diane Mizrahi
Primary Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100

March 4, 2005